



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/312,740	05/14/1999	DOUGLAS F. BEAVEN	108473.114	2986
25247	7590	04/07/2006	EXAMINER	
GORDON E NELSON PATENT ATTORNEY, PC 57 CENTRAL ST PO BOX 782 ROWLEY, MA 01969			KRISCIUNAS, LINDA MARY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3623	

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/312,740	BEAVEN, DOUGLAS F.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Linda Krisciunas	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 187-210 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 187-210 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is a Final Office Action in response to the applicant's response filed March 15, 2006. Claims 187-210 are pending. Claims 187-188, 190-193, and 198 have been amended.

Response to Amendment

2. The Examiner has reviewed and accepted the amended language of claims 187, 191 and 192 and withdraws the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection.

Response to Arguments

3. The Examiner has fully considered the applicant's arguments and they are deemed mute in light of the new rejection listed below.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 197 and 210 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

Art Unit: 3623

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 187-194 and 197-210 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Buteau et al (US 6,442,557).

As per claim 187, Buteau teaches a processor which has access to a representation of a model of the business, the model including representations of model entities, a given representation of a model entity being capable of simultaneously belonging to hierarchies including a hierarchy and another hierarchy, and the representations of model entities providing access to information relating to the business (column 15, lines 25-38, where people can access information on enterprise processes to read or modify the information. Column 9, lines 59-67, where there is a hierarchical organization charts and column 10, lines 6-20, where the hierarchical organization can belong to another hierarchical organization); and an interface to the system, the interface provided by the processor and the interface receiving first inputs from the person, the processor responding to the first inputs by outputting the representations of the model entities, of the hierarchies, and/or of the information to which the model entities provide access in tangible form and further receiving second inputs from the person to which the processor responds by modifying the representations of the model entities, the hierarchies, and/or the information to which the representations of the model entities provide access (See Figure 5, where there are various access types and as noted in column 15, lines 28-30, the user can modify the information. Also noted in column 2, lines 35-67, specifically: "The database

program is capable of allowing users to input and search for how architectural changes to the enterprise affects the enterprise architecture. A screen is generated on which a user inputs a search to show the impact that a specific entity has on the enterprise architecture."); use representations of the model entities that belong to hierarchies including a hierarchy and another hierarchy, and the representations of model entities providing access to information relating to the business for the purpose of efficiently organizing and accessing information (column 5, lines 26-32, where the system is a framework for organizing information about specific information models. See also column 9, lines 59-63 and column 10, lines 6-10, where the enterprise is a hierarchical group of people and the organization may be part of another organization. See also Figure 4.).

As per claim 188, Buteau teaches sorting according to a hierarchy structure for the purpose of providing a more efficient means for storing and accessing information (column 9, lines 59-63 and column 7, lines 36-58, where there is a hierarchical structure and the work flow model includes entities, including an information access entity where people working in the enterprise can access information in repositories in different ways).

As per claim 189, Buteau teaches the model entity includes representations of the information. (column 5, lines 26-32, where the system is a framework for organizing information about specific information models)

As per claim 190, Buteau teaches an interface for inputs the processor sorts the entities according to values of the included representations of information.

(communication interface (118) and Figure 8 and column 22, lines 20-30, where there is an input screen to input information into the database. The interface can also be used for queries.)

As per claim 191, Buteau teaches there is a plurality of types of model entities, a representation of a model entity specifies the represented model entity's type (column 5, lines 26-32, where the system is a framework for organizing information about specific information models).

As per claims 198-206, they recite substantially the same limitations as 187-191 with the distinction of the recited system being a method. Hence the same rejections apply for claims 198-206 as applied for claims 187-191.

As per claim 192, Buteau teaches the model has further representations of further information that are related to the model entities (column 21, lines 13-25, where there are multiple service layers and multiple relationships between the layers); the processor responds to further inputs of the first input by outputting the representations of the further information and receives further inputs of the second inputs to which the processor responds by accessing the related further information (column 21, lines 45-48 and column 22, lines 1-14, where the service layer entity depends on the service model entity and is used by the service set entity where the service models, layers, sets and services are an abstract way of specifying the technology components of an enterprise architecture. They are often required to specify a new architecture and associate different technology components with different service models.).

As per claim 193, Buteau teaches the interface to receive further inputs of the second inputs to which the processor responds by modifying the further information (communication interface (118) and Figure 8 and column 22, lines 20-30, where there is an input screen to input information into the database. The interface can also be used for queries).

As per 194, Buteau teaches the additional information is a document that is accessible to the system (see column 2, line 38: data structure).

As per 197 and 210, Buteau teaches a data storage device (see column 2, line 43: database).

As per claims 207-209, they recite substantially the same limitations as claims 192-196 with respect to the number of indications received. Hence the same rejections apply for claims 207-209 as applied for claims 192-196.

7. Claims 195 and 196 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buteau.

As per 195, Buteau does not explicitly teach information is a message sent to a person by another person. Official notice is taken that both the concept and advantage of sending messages between people is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided a messaging system between people in a processing management system to provide a more efficient means of communicating information.

As per claim 196, Buteau does not explicitly teach there is an information discussion concerning the model entity among the persons. Official notice is taken that

both the concept and advantage of discussing model entities (projects etc) between people (team members) is well known and expected in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided a discussion means between people to provide a more efficient means of communicating project/management related information

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

9. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following art also teaches about hierarchical organization

Art Unit: 3623

structures that allow modifications: Buteau et al (US 6,442,557) and Hill et al (US 6,670,973), Cheng et al (US 6,067,548), Puri et al (US 6,751,622).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Linda Krisciunas whose telephone number is 571-272-6931. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 6:30 am to 3:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 571-272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LMK

LMK
April 3, 2006


TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600